

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application, of which claim 1 is independent. In view of the following Remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection for the reasons discussed below.

Allowed/Allowable Claims

Applicant appreciates the indication that claims 2-20 contain allowable subject matter. While Applicant agrees these claims are patentable over the cited references, Applicant does not agree that patentability resides in each feature exactly as expressed in the claims, nor that each feature is required for patentability of each claim.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0046925 by Matsuda ("Matsuda"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites "a first distance in the first direction between the liquid crystal dots is equal to or smaller than a second distance in a second direction perpendicular to the first direction between the liquid crystal dots". In this regard, the Examiner asserted that this claimed feature is disclosed in Matsuda. This assertion is respectfully disagreed with.

As described in MPEP 2131, in order to anticipate a claim, "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim." *Richardson*

v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Thus, in order for Matsui to anticipate claim 1, Matsui must show the identical invention as complete detail as is contained in claim 1.

However, the invention disclosed in Matsuda is directed to aligning two substrates with high alignment precision in a short period of time, and has no relevance to the same or different distances between the liquid crystal dots. In fact, Matsuda does not disclose the same or different distances between liquid crystal dots. Thus, it is submitted that Matsui fails to show the identical invention as complete detail as is contained in claim 1. This is further evidenced by the fact that the Examiner was not able to point out which portion of Matsui discloses the distances between liquid crystal drops.

For this reason, it is submitted that claim 1 is patentable over Matsui. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection of claims 1.


Conclusion

Applicant believes that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action and respectfully submits that all of the stated ground for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,



Hae-Chan Park
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: July 27, 2005

McGuireWoods LLP
1750 Tysons Boulevard
Suite 1800
McLean, VA 22102-4215
Tel: 703-712-5365
Fax: 703-712-5280

HCP:WSC/arc

\\COM\520797.1